REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed September 7, 2007. Claims 1-21 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, and 18-20 have been amended. Claims 1-21 remain pending in this case. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith, and entry of the amendments to the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, regarding claim 1, the Examiner inquired about the relationship between "a plurality of applications" and "one or more remote computer systems" as well as the relationship between "one or more subtasks" and "each of the plurality of applications." Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, in pertinent part, "wherein the instructions for performing the task comprise instructions for performing a respective one of the subtasks by executing a respective one of the plurality of applications on a respective one of each of the plurality of remote computer systems." Additionally, the Examiner inquired about the nature of the "portable format" in claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, in pertinent part, "wherein the portable format comprises a cross-platform format readable by the first computer system and the plurality of remote computer systems." Applicant has also amended claim 1 to remove the phrase "one or more subtasks" noted by the Examiner.

Claims 8 and 15 have been similarly amended. Support for the amendments may be found in Applicant's specification at least on page 5, lines 6-17 and page 59, line 20 to page 60, line 4. In light of the claim amendments, withdrawal of the rejections under § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7-10, 14-17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lowry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,206, hereinafter "Lowry"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Anticipation under § 102(e) requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed below, Lowry fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites:

1.   A method for performing a task using a plurality of applications in a networked computer environment, the method comprising:
        sending instructions for performing the task from a first computer system to a plurality of remote computer systems, wherein the task comprises a plurality of subtasks, wherein the instructions for performing the task comprise instructions for performing a respective one of the subtasks by executing a respective one of the plurality of applications on a respective one of each of the plurality of remote computer systems, wherein the instructions for performing the task comprise a plurality of messages in a portable format, and wherein the portable format comprises a cross-platform format readable by the first computer system and the plurality of remote computer systems;
        translating the instructions for performing the task from the portable format to an executable format at the plurality of remote computer systems, wherein the translating comprises generating executable instructions for performing the plurality of subtasks; and
        executing the executable instructions to perform the subtasks, wherein executing the executable instructions comprises invoking the respective one of the plurality of applications on the respective one of each of the plurality of remote computer systems.

Applicant respectfully submits that Lowry does not teach or suggest a method comprising "sending instructions for performing the task from a first computer system to a plurality of remote computer systems, wherein the task comprises a plurality of subtasks, wherein the instructions for performing the task comprise instructions for performing a respective one of the subtasks by executing a respective one of the plurality of applications on a respective one of each of the plurality of remote computer systems" and "executing the executable instructions to perform the subtasks, wherein executing the executable instructions comprises invoking the respective one of the plurality of applications on the respective one of each of the plurality of remote computer systems" as recited in claim 1.

Lowry discloses techniques for permitting communication between disparate applications using an XML interface. XML-based bridging techniques may be used to implement a virtual hub between various applications (e.g., col. 4, lines 7-9). However, Lowry does not teach or suggest that instructions for performing a task are sent from a first computer system <u>to a plurality of remote computer systems</u>. Instead, Lowry discloses that one individual application may request a service provided by another individual application (e.g., col. 3, lines 27-46). Applicant also cannot find any teaching or suggestion in Lowry that <u>a task comprises a plurality of subtasks</u>, wherein the instructions for performing the task comprise instructions for <u>performing a respective one of the subtasks by executing a respective one of the plurality of applications on a respective one of each of the plurality of remote computer systems</u>. In the example disclosed in col. 3, lines 27-46 and cited by the Examiner, Lowry's task (opening a WordPerfect document) does not comprise a plurality of subtasks, wherein the instructions for performing the task comprise instructions for performing a respective one of the subtasks by executing a respective one of the plurality of applications on a respective one of each of the plurality of remote computer systems. Execution of Lowry's WordPerfect task involves a single application (WordPerfect) on a single

computer and therefore does not comprise invoking a respective one of a plurality of applications on a respective one of each of a plurality of remote computer systems.

Lowry also discloses that multiple services or applications may subscribe to an event (e.g., col. 5, line 52 to col. 7, line 37). When an event is published, the event is sent to the relevant subscribers (e.g., col. 6, lines 43-60). However, each subscriber analyzes the event independently and determines what action, if any, it should take (e.g., col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 19). Therefore, Lowry's subscription scheme does not involve sending instructions for performing a task from a first computer system to a plurality of remote computer systems.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are patentably distinct from Lowry. Applicant asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, and 21 is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 6, 11, 13, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowry in view of Tso et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,050, hereinafter "Tso"). Claims 5, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowry in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,975, hereinafter "Chen"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Applicant asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of claims 4-6, 11-13, and 18-20 is not necessary at this time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above-referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5602-11600/JCH.

<div style="margin-left: 3in;">

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey C. Hood/
Jeffrey C. Hood, Reg. #35198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

</div>

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: November 14, 2007   JCH/RPH